



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,954	02/09/2004	W. Paul Willes	23839-11592	8643
758 7590 03/30/2007 FENWICK & WEST LLP SILICON VALLEY CENTER 801 CALIFORNIA STREET MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041			EXAMINER HERNANDEZ, NELSON D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/30/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/774,954	Applicant(s) WILLES ET AL.	
	Examiner Nelson D. Hernandez	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/9/2004 & 8/18/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.
2. **Claim 20** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Claim 20 recites the limitation "said network device" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The limitation "a network device" is found in claim 19. Therefore, for examining purposes, claim 20 will be read as dependent from claim 19.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. **Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 18-20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganthier, US Patent 6,081,422 in view of Ward, US Patent 6,784,924 B2.**

Regarding claim 1, claim 1 is written in a Markush type by using the expression "adjustment method selected from the group consisting of manually, mechanically or electronically", meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. "A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus." The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Ganthier discloses a network video camera (Fig. 2: 200) mounting system (Figs. 1: 100 and 2: 100) comprising:

A. an adjustable video sensor assembly (See fig. 2) wherein said video sensor assembly further comprises an image sensor (an image sensor is inherent in the camera shown in Ganthier) and a network camera lens (Fig. 2: 206), wherein said video sensor assembly allows the viewing angle of said image sensor to be changed by a adjustment manually (Col. 4, lines 3-24);

B. a mounting assembly (Figs. 1: 100 and 2: 100);

C. an interface (Fig. 2: 110) which transmits images from said image sensor;

D. a low profile housing (upper housing 202 in conjunction with lower housing 208; see fig. 2) which further comprises said adjustable video sensor assembly; and

E. wherein said mounting assembly is attached to said low profile housing and wherein said mounting assembly performs the function of flush mounting (As shown in fig. 7, the mounting assembly 100 perform the function of flush mounting; see that the

Art Unit: 2622

mount is flush mounted to the monitor 300) (Col. 3, lines 23-24; col. 5, line 5 – col. 6, line 21).

Ganthier does not explicitly disclose in the invention that the interface is a network interface.

However, Ward teaches a camera comprising a network interface (Fig. 1: 32) to transmit the captured image data through a network allowing a user to send the image data to different locations such as personal home pages in the World Wide Web, cellular phones, kiosks, etc. without having to connect the camera to a computer to send the image data (Col. 2, lines 38-58; col. 3, line 16 – col. 4, line 19).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the interface in Ganthier by having a network interface. The motivation to do so would have been to allow the user to send the image data to different locations such as personal home pages in the World Wide Web, cellular phones, kiosks, etc. without having to connect the camera to a computer to send the image data.

Regarding claim 2, low profile housing further comprises a mounting point (See mounting point 212 connecting the housing to the mounting assembly using a connector 114 that engages to the mounting point 212 using tabs 122 and 120 to securely connect the housing to the mounting assembly) and wherein said mounting assembly is connected to said mounting point (Col. Col. 4, lines 3-32).

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claim 3, claim 3 is written in a Markush type by using the expression “a connector selected from the group consisting of threads, screws, snaps, rivets, plugs, Velcro, connectors, spring material, compression material, and pins”, meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. “A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus.” The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Ganthier discloses using a connector 114 that engages to the mounting point 212 using tabs 122 and 120 to securely connect the housing to the mounting assembly) (Col. Col. 4, lines 3-32).

Regarding claim 4, claim 4 is written in a Markush type by using the expression “mounting point is selected from the group consisting of a front mounting point, a side mounting point, a top mounting point, bottom rear mounting point, a rear mounting point and a clip-on attachment point”, meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. “A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus.” The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Ganthier discloses that the mounting point is a bottom rear mounting point (See mounting point 212 located on the bottom rear part of the housing as shown in fig. 3).

Regarding claim 8, the combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches that the images from said image sensor can be seen remotely over a network (Ward teaches that the images can be sent to a cell phone, a web page, etc., by teaching that Ward teaches that the images from said image sensor can be seen remotely over a network; col. 2, lines 38-58; col. 3, line 16 – col. 4, line 19).

Regarding claim 9, claim 9 is written in a Markush type by using the expression “network is a network selected from the group consisting of a power line network, a wireless network, an acoustic network, a wired network, the Internet, a Local Area Network, a Wide Area Network, and an optic network”, meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. “A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus.” The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches that the network is a network selected from the group consisting of a wireless network, a wired network, the Internet, a Local Area Network and a Wide Area Network (See Ward, col. 2, lines 38-58; col. 3, line 16 – col. 4, line 19).

Regarding claim 11, claim 11 is written in a Markush type by using the expression “image sensor is powered from a power source selected from the group consisting of solar power, battery power, AC power, and DC power”, meeting one

species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. "A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus." The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Ganthier discloses that the image sensor is powered from a power source consisting of DC power (by teaching that the camera uses a USB connector for electrical connection (Col. 3, lines 22-36), USB is characterized by supplying data and power between two connected devices).

Regarding claim 14, limitations can be found in claim 1.

Regarding claim 16, the combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches that the image sensor views images through a transparent medium (Ganthier discloses that the image sensor views images through a transparent medium by teaching lens 206 as shown in fig. 2; see also Ward, fig. 1: 20).

Regarding claim 18, claim 18 is written in a Markush type by using the expression "network interface is connected to a device selected from the group consisting of a bridge, a hub, a switch, a router, a gateway, and a power adapter", meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. "A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus." The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re

Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches that the network interface is connected to a device selected from the group consisting of a bridge, a hub, a switch, a router, a gateway (by teaching that the interface may connect to a variety of known networks, such as a public switched telephone network (PSTN), ISDN, an RF cellular phone network, or Ethernet (col. 2, lines 39-59), Ward teaches connecting to a router, bridge, switch or hub).

Regarding claim 19, the combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches that the network interface is connected to a network device wherein said network device converts from one protocol to another (by teaching that the interface may connect to a variety of known networks, such as a public switched telephone network (PSTN), ISDN, an RF cellular phone network, or Ethernet (col. 2, lines 39-59), Ward teaches connecting to a network device wherein said network device converts from one protocol to another, since the image data may be transferred to a telephone or a web page, the protocol between devices changes).

Regarding claim 20, limitations can be found in claim 18.

Regarding claim 22, the combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward as discussed and analyzed in claim 1 teaches that the network camera stores images in a storage device (See Ward, fig. 1: 28 or fig. 1: 30; col. 3, 40-65).

Regarding claim 23, claim 23 is written in a Markush type by using the expression "adjustment method selected from the group consisting of manually,

Art Unit: 2622

mechanically or electronically”, meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. “A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus.” The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Ganthier discloses a network video camera (Fig. 2: 200) mounting system (Figs. 1: 100 and 2: 100) comprising:

A. an adjustable video sensor assembly (See fig. 2) wherein said video sensor assembly further comprises an image sensor (an image sensor is inherent in the camera shown in Ganthier) and a network camera lens (Fig. 2: 206), wherein said video sensor assembly allows the viewing angle of said image sensor to be changed by a adjustment manually (Col. 4, lines 3-24);

B. a multipurpose flat mounting assembly (Figs. 1: 100 and 2: 100; the mounting allows the maintain the camera in place while performing pan and tilt operations and allow connectivity between the camera and the computer(Col. 3, lines 23-24; col. 5, line 5 – col. 6, line 21));

C. an interface (Fig. 2: 110) which transmits images from said image sensor;

D. a low profile housing (upper housing 202 in conjunction with lower housing 208; see fig. 2) which further comprises said adjustable video sensor assembly; and

E. wherein said mounting assembly is attached to said low profile housing and wherein said mounting assembly performs the function of flush mounting (As shown in fig. 7, the mounting assembly 100 perform the function of flush mounting; see that the

Art Unit: 2622

mount is flush mounted to the monitor 300) (Col. 3, lines 23-24; col. 5, line 5 – col. 6, line 21).

Ganthier does not explicitly disclose in the invention that the interface is a network interface.

However, Ward teaches a camera comprising a network interface (Fig. 1: 32) to transmit the captured image data through a network allowing a user to send the image data to different locations such as personal home pages in the World Wide Web, cellular phones, kiosks, etc. without having to connect the camera to a computer to send the image data (Col. 2, lines 38-58; col. 3, line 16 – col. 4, line 19).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the interface in Ganthier by having a network interface. The motivation to do so would have been to allow the user to send the image data to different locations such as personal home pages in the World Wide Web, cellular phones, kiosks, etc. without having to connect the camera to a computer to send the image data.

6. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganthier, US Patent 6,081,422 in view of Ward, US Patent 6,784,924 B2 and further in view of Kendrick, US Patent 6,175,300 B1.

Regarding claim 5, claim 5 is written in a Markush type by using the expression “mounting assembly is selected from the group consisting of a suction cup mounting

Art Unit: 2622

assembly a multi-purpose suction cup mounting assembly, a multi-purpose flat mounting assembly, a clip-on suction cup mounting assembly and a bracket mounting assembly”, meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. “A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus.” The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward fails to teach that the mounting assembly is selected from the group consisting of a suction cup mounting assembly a multi-purpose suction cup mounting assembly, a multi-purpose flat mounting assembly, a clip-on suction cup mounting assembly and a bracket mounting assembly.

However, Kendrick teaches a remotely controlled camera (See fig. 10: 10), comprising a pair of suction cups (16 and 17 as shown in fig. 10) used to mount the camera to a flat structure (in this case a rear stop signal and lamp assembly of a car) so that the camera can work as a rear mirror, wherein said camera can be remotely controlled so that the user can perform pan and tilt to the camera from the seat of the car (Col. 5, lines 2-25).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward and further in view of Kendrick as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the mounting assembly in Ganthier by using suction cups to attach the camera to the monitor. The motivation to do so would

Art Unit: 2622

have been to maintain the camera in place with an easy to detach mounting assembly that can be attached to different type of flat surfaces.

Regarding claim 6, limitations can be found in claim 5.

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganthier, US Patent 6,081,422 in view of Ward, US Patent 6,784,924 B2 and further in view of Novak, US 2002/0141657 A1.

Regarding claim 7, the combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward fails to teach that the video sensor assembly is electronically remotely adjustable via sensor resolution and wide-angle optics.

However, Novak teaches a system for controlling a web-cam transmission wherein a web-cam capable of capturing images of a wide field (i.e. using wide angle lens) stores the images in a memory and said images are processes so that a remote user can control the field of view by performing simulated pan and tilt functions wherein the user is observing a portion of the image and if wants to see a different portion of the image, the processor send a different portion of the image (This also teaches adjusting the field of view using sensor resolution since only a portion of the whole resolution of the sensor is transmitted) so that there is not need to have pan and tilt motors controlling a camera movement (Page 1, ¶ 0006 and 0023; page 2, ¶0024; page 3, ¶ 0036 and 0043).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward and further in view of Novak as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ganthier and Ward by having the video

Art Unit: 2622

sensor assembly is electronically remotely adjustable via sensor resolution and wide angle optics. The motivation to do so would have been to avoid the use of motors to control the pan and tilt function as suggested by Novak (Page 2, ¶0024).

8. Claims 10, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganthier, US Patent 6,081,422 in view of Ward, US Patent 6,784,924 B2 and further in view of Schnell, US Patent 6,768,868 B1.

Regarding claim 10, the combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward fails to teach that the housing is weatherproof.

However, the use of waterproof housings for cameras is notoriously well known in the art as taught by Schnell. Schnell teaches a housing (Fig. 7: 702) for a camera (See fig. 7, said housing being waterproof so that the camera can be outdoors while being protected from the weather changes (Col. 5, line 54 – col. 6, line 10; see also col. 2, lines 50-65).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward and further in view of Schnell as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the housing in Ganthier by having a housing being weatherproof. The motivation to do so would have been to improve the housing so it can protect the camera and inside camera components from the weather and temperature changes as suggested by Schnell (Col. 2, lines 50-65).

Regarding claim 12, the combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward and further in view of Schnell as discussed and analyzed in claim 10 teaches that a back cover is connected to the rear of said housing (See Schnell, back cover 703b in fig. 7).

Regarding claim 13, the combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward and further in view of Schnell as discussed and analyzed in claim 10 teaches that a flush mounting back cover is connected to the rear of said housing (in Schnell, back cover 103b is mounted to the camera so the camera can be flush mounted to a tree, post, or other mounting surface; col. 3, lines 33-43).

9. Claims 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganthier, US Patent 6,081,422 in view of Ward, US Patent 6,784,924 B2 and further in view of Manico, US Patent 5,904,330.

Regarding claim 15, claim 15 is written in a Markush type by using the expression "with a surface selected from the group consisting of a window and a transparent medium", meeting one species of a genus family anticipates the claimed subject matter. "A generic claim cannot be allowed to an applicant if the prior art discloses a species falling within the claimed genus." The species in that case will anticipate the genus. In re Slayter, 276 F.2d 408, 411, 125 USPQ 345, 347 (CCPA 1960); In re Gosteli, 872 F.2d 1008, 10 USPQ2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward fails to teach that the image sensor views images through a glare shield that is flush with a surface selected from the group consisting of a window and a transparent medium.

However, using a glare shield that is flush with a surface that reflects light is notoriously well known in the art as taught by Manico. Manico discloses a window mounted camera system, comprising a camera (Fig. 1: 16), a mounting structure having

a chamber (Fig. 1: 44) mounted flush with the window (Fig. 1: 54), the chamber shielding the camera from light reflected on the window (glare); said mounting structure is mounted to the window by using suction cups (56, 58 and 60 as shown in fig. 1) (Col. 1, line 48 – col. 2, line 41). Having a chamber in the camera so it can be mounted flush with a surface is advantageous because said chamber can help protecting the camera from light reflected on the surface.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward and further in view of Manico as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ganthier and Ward by having the camera viewing images through a glare shield that is flush with a surface selected from the group consisting of a window and a transparent medium. The motivation to do so would have been to improve the image capture by protecting the camera from light reflected on the surface as suggested by Manico (Col. 1, line 48 – col. 2, line 41).

Regarding claim 17, limitations can be found in claim 15.

10. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganthier, US Patent 6,081,422 in view of Ward, US Patent 6,784,924 B2 and further in view of Strandwitz, US 2003/0112335 A1.

Regarding claim 21, the combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward fails to teach that the network interface further comprises a bandwidth allocation system.

However, the use of a bandwidth allocation system in a camera is well known in the art as taught by Strandwitz. Strandwitz teaches a wireless camera (See fig. 2) that

Art Unit: 2622

transmit images through a network, wherein said camera comprises a bandwidth allocation system (See fig. 2: 190) used to find a proportion of available bandwidth in a connection serving a plurality of camera so as to define percentage of allocation of bandwidth for a given camera or from one camera to another (Page 2, ¶0028, page 3, ¶0035; page 5, ¶0063).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Ganthier in view of Ward and further in view of Strandwitz as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ganthier and Ward by having a bandwidth allocation system to communicate in a network. The motivation to do so would have been to properly define a portion of the bandwidth to interact to transmit the images or interact with multiple terminals in the network and to receive a proper amount of bandwidth as required by the camera when transmitting image data.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nelson D. Hernandez whose telephone number is (571) 272-7311. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on (571) 272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nelson D. Hernandez
Examiner
Art Unit 2622

NDHH
March 20, 2007


TUAN HO
PRIMARY EXAMINER